



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Robert J. Small et al.

Confirmation No: 7752

Application No.: 10/619,708

Art Unit: 1755

Filed: July 14, 2003

Examiner: M. Marcheschi

For: **CATALYTIC COMPOSITION FOR  
CHEMICAL-MECHANICAL  
POLISHING, METHOD OF USING  
SAME, AND SUBSTRATE TREATED  
WITH SAME**

Attorney Docket No.: 063254-5004-US

(formerly CHEM.004US2)

**SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Randolph Building – Customer Service Window  
401 Dulaney Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

The undersigned Applicant's representative would like to thank Examiner Marcheschi for the interviews he participated in on Monday, July 7, 2005. Applicant's representative would further like to thank Examiner Marcheschi for his initiative in obtaining review of proposed amendments in sufficient time such that further discussions could take place that day. The interview encompassed four (4) applications and took a great deal of the Examiner's time and consideration.

Applicants representative and the Examiner discussed the Amendment and Terminal disclaimer that had been filed on June 24, 2005. The Examiner inquired about a related case, pending application 10/393,542, that was included in the Terminal disclaimer. Applicant's representative stated he believed it was the Applicant's intent to abandon that case, titled FENTON'S REAGENT COMPOSITION FOR CHEMICAL-MECHANICAL POLISHING, METHOD OF USING SAME, AND SUBSTRATE TREATED WITH SAME. The Examiner requested that an express abandonment be filed in that related case. Applicants representative agreed, and filed an express abandonment in the related case that same day.

Applicant's representative discussed the amendments to the claims, explaining how they substantially incorporated limitations of allowable claims into the independent claims. The Examiner opined that on his review of the pending claims and art, such amendments might be insufficient. The Examiner opined that an oxide might be "a source of the ion" as recited in the claims. Applicant's representative offered to place a clause in the independent claims specifically excluding oxides. Applicant's representative showed the support, paragraph 31, where a list of exemplary forms the metal "catalyst" could take, which included oxides, as well as nitrates, halides, acetates .... The Examiner provisionally concurred, and a brief recess was had while the Examiner discussed the proposed amendment with other PTO personnel. The interview resumed with the Examiner opining the support for the proposed amendment was too tenuous. Applicant's representative and the Examiner then entertained a number of alternative wording, and finally agreed on words that showed that while the catalyst was a source of the metal ion, that the ion was connected to the particle. Applicant's representative pointed out that the examples, particularly claim 44, showed the catalyst attached to the silica was "cationic", that is, was an ion. Applicant's representative then suggested a further amendment to the claim to recite that the catalyst was a source of an ion, and that the ion was connected to the particle. The Examiner agreed to the amendment, and agreed to add that clause by Examiner's amendment into the pertinent pending independent claims.

It is believed no fees are due at this time for this or any other pending filing; however, should a fee be deemed necessary, please charge to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Deposit Account 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher G. Hayden Reg. No. 44,750  
**Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 739-3000

Date July 22, 2005